

United States District Court, Eastern District of Washington
Magistrate Judge Mary K. Dimke
Richland

USA v. ANDRES GUTIERREZ

Case No. 4:21-MJ-7015-MKD-2

Video Conference
The Defendant agreed to appear via video conference.

Detention Hearing:

01/22/2021

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pam Howard, Courtroom Deputy [Y] | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Benjamin Seal, US Atty (video) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Erica Helms, US Probation / Pretrial Services (tele) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Robin Emmans, Defense Atty (video) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant present <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in custody USM appearing by video from Benton County Jail | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interpreter – Natalia Rivera |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant continued detained | <input type="checkbox"/> Defendant not present / failed to appear |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Conditions of Release imposed | <input type="checkbox"/> 199C Advice of Penalties/Sanctions |

REMARKS

Due the current COVID-19 public health crises, all parties including Defendant, appeared by video or teleconference.

Court has reviewed the pretrial services report and the filing by Defense counsel.

USA proffered the pretrial services report and concurs with its recommendation of continued detention of the Defendant.

USA outlines the drug conspiracy and advised the Court a large amount of drugs and cash were recovered from Defendant's apartment that he shared with his wife and small child and such conduct is a danger to the community. USA argues Defendant's lack of status in this country, prior deportations and the mandatory minimum Defendant could be facing will be an incentive to flee.

Court colloquy with USA regarding the amount of cash that was seized. USA responds \$90,000 cash was seized.

Defense counsel argued why the Defendant should be released and proffers the letter in support of Defendant that was filed on the docket.

The Court ordered:

1. USA's Motion for Detention is **granted**. The presumption of detention has not been rebutted.
2. That there is no combination of conditions to assure the Defendant's appearance as required.
3. Defendant shall be detained by the U.S. Marshal until further order of the Court.